

Helena Nemec Rudež and Ksenija Vodeb

Perceived tourism impacts in municipalities with different tourism concentration

Abstract

The paper investigates residents' perceptions of tourism impacts in Koper and Piran municipality which are located on the Slovenian coast. The two municipalities have different tourism concentration defined as the ratio between the number of tourists and the number of residents. Specifically, the study attempts to explore differences between tourism impacts in the two municipalities. For the purpose of this study, tourism impacts are divided into economic, socio-cultural and environmental. Primary research was conducted on a sample of residents in the municipalities of Koper and Piran in April 2008. A survey was collected from 111 residents in the study area. A descriptive statistics and t-test for independent samples were employed. The findings reveal that residents' perceptions of tourism differ between municipalities which have different tourism concentration. In fact, residents in the municipality with the higher tourism concentration perceive more negative tourism impacts, whilst, on the other hand, they do not perceive more positive tourism impacts. Negative environmental tourism impacts were found in both municipalities. Positive as well as negative socio-cultural and economic tourism impacts were confirmed in Koper and Piran municipality. Recommendations for tourism policy makers and tourism managers are given.

Keywords:

economic tourism impacts; socio-cultural tourism impacts; environmental tourism impacts; tourism concentration; Slovenia

Introduction

Tourism generates a large set of impacts outside the tourism market, which are defined in the literature as tourism externalities. Following Samuelson and Nordhaus (2005, p. 36), they are recognized in the economy as a type of market failure causing involuntary costs or benefits outside the marketplace. A wide range of literature has been investigating impacts of tourism in the last two decades. The growth of tourism accelerates the appearance of new tourism impacts, and thus, constitutes a reason for more research regarding tourism impacts. Indeed, the tourism industry has great potential to affect the lives of community residents (Andereck, Valentine, Knopf, & Vogt, 2005, p. 1057).

Helena Nemec Rudež, PhD, University of Primorska, Faculty of Tourism Studies – TURISTICA, Portorož, Slovenia;
E-mail: helena.nemec@turistica.si

Ksenija Vodeb, PhD, University of Primorska, Faculty of Tourism Studies – TURISTICA, Portorož, Slovenia;
E-mail: ksenija.vodeb@turistica.si

For the purpose of our research, we deal with local tourism impacts in the area of Piran and Koper. They are two out of the three municipalities located on the Slovenian coast, which represents one of the main Slovenian destinations. The municipalities of Koper and Piran are quite different destinations in the number of tourists and tourism concentration. Therefore, it allows the comparison of residents' perceptions of tourism impacts in destinations with different tourist intensity.

The aim of the paper is to evaluate residents' perceptions of tourism impacts in the given municipalities and compare the perceptions of residents between the two municipalities with a different tourism concentration regarding economic, socio-cultural and environmental tourism impacts. Empirical research is used for this purpose. In this way the results will shed a light on the differences or similarities of tourism impacts in areas with different tourism concentration. A wide range of literature confirms that it is important for tourism planners and tourism managers to know residents' perceptions of tourism (Aguilo, & Rossello, 2005, pp. 927-928). Consequently, appropriate tourism development strategies can be chosen.

As already noted by Curto (2006, p. 1), it cannot be assumed that residents have a knowledge of all potential tourism impacts, but the study of residents' perceptions of tourism impacts can reveal the perceptions of tourism impacts from their perspective. It can be taken as a limitation of the subject of research.

The paper is structured as follows. The next section provides the literature review. This is followed by the research design regarding impacts of tourism. After that the results of the empirical study are presented. The paper closes with discussion and concluding remarks.

Literature review

Tourism activity imposes different effects to tourism companies, tourists and residents (Bull, 1995; Sinclair, & Stabler, 1997; Page, 2005; Vanhove, 2005; Tribe, 2005). In fact, tourism production might be affected by tourists or tourism enterprises through noise, traffic congestions, water pollution or other. Tourists as well as residents can also feel tourism impacts imposed through other tourists or tourism enterprises by depletion of landscape, fauna and flora, pollution, traffic congestion etc. It is crucial to recognize and manage negative tourism impacts since they generate costs for the society. Price-based instruments and regulatory methods, examined by Sinclair and Stabler (1997), can be introduced to lower or eliminate negative tourism impacts.

Tourism impacts are often classified into economic, socio-cultural and environmental tourism impacts (for instance Liu, & Var, 1986; Liu, Sheldo, & Var, 1987; Andereck, 1995; Bull, 1995; Kuvan, & Akan, 2005; Aguillo, & Rossello, 2005). In this way a better understanding of tourism impacts can be made enabling an appropriate management of tourism benefits and tourism costs in the host community. Economic tourism impacts have an impact on the economic base of residents. They comprise elements such as price increase, employment, revenue and infrastructure development.

Socio-cultural tourism impacts affect the social and cultural life of residents, such as the quality of life, the quality of several services, events, cultural heritage, tradition, crime and traffic. Environmental tourism impacts include impacts of tourism on the environment, usually comprising negative impacts or damages, such as the pollution of air, soil, water and noise, the depletion of natural resources, land construction, litter.

Empirical research investigating and identifying tourism impacts perceived by residents is vast (for instance Liu, & Var, 1986; Liu, Sheldon, & Var, 1987; Haralambopoulos, & Pizam, 1996; Smith, & Krannich, 1998; Andereck, & Vogh, 2000; Tomljenovic, & Faulkner, 2000; Williams, & Lawson, 2001; Besculides, Lee, & McCormick, 2002; Teye, Sirakaya, & Soenmez, 2002; Tosun, 2002; Kuvan, & Akan, 2005; Aquilo, & Rossello, 2005; Tsaur, Lin, & Lin, 2006; Bestard, & Nadal, 2007; Urtasun, & Gutierrez, 2006; Lepp, 2007). Indeed, tourism has obvious positive and negative impacts on the host region. Literature confirms that the support of tourism by the host community is essential for the successful development of tourism (Kuvan, & Akan, 2005, p. 691). Similarly, Teye, Sirakaya and Sonmez (2002, p. 686) argue that it is critical to involve the community in the planning and development of the tourism industry.

The residents' perceptions of tourism impacts are influenced by the tourism concentration or intensity that is measured by the tourist ratio. It is defined as the ratio of the number of tourists to the number of residents. Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) developed a framework for tourism impacts on destination community and identified the extrinsic dimension of tourism impacts, referring to the characteristics of the location and including also tourist ratio and seasonality, and intrinsic dimension of tourism impacts, referring to characteristics of members of the host community.

Considering the abovementioned studies, we can derive that the extrinsic dimension of tourism impacts is rarely tested. However, the correlation of the tourist ratio and residents' perceptions of the tourism impacts was studied by Liu, Sheldon and Var (1987) and Ap (1990). High tourism concentration can reduce positive impacts of tourism and generate the negative ones as already noted by Sinclair and Stabler (1997, p. 178). The focus of the study is to contribute to the literature on extrinsic dimension of tourism impacts. Therefore, the perceptions of tourism impacts on residents who live in municipalities with different tourism concentration will be analyzed.

Following Tosun (2002), every study of tourism impacts is unique because it is related to its own characteristics, which makes it difficult to derive its worldwide validity. It implies the need for the study of tourism impacts on residents in each specific region.

Research design

The research aimed at finding how impacts of tourism are perceived by local residents in the municipalities of Piran and Koper and whether there is a difference in residents' perception of tourism impacts between the municipalities with different tourism concentration. The area of the municipalities of Piran and Koper on the Slovenian coast with different tourism concentration were taken as a field survey.

In fact, there were 376,535 tourists in the Municipality of Piran and 81,708 tourists in the Municipality of Koper in 2007 compared to 17,375 residents in the Municipality of Piran and 50,145 residents¹ in the Municipality of Koper in that year. Data were obtained from the Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia (SURS, 2008). Therefore, tourists outnumbered the local residents in the Municipality of Piran while this was not true for the Municipality of Koper. Considering the presence of tourism seasonality in both municipalities showing peak months in summer, we can see that tourists outnumbered the resident population in the Municipality of Piran in 9 out of 12 months in 2007 except in January, February and December. In the peak month (August) tourists outnumbered the residents in the Municipality of Piran by the factor 3.13, when there were 54,416 tourists in the referring year. On the other hand, there were not more tourists than residents in the Municipality of Koper throughout the year. In the peak month (July) there were only 15,712 tourists in 2007. The ratio between the number of tourists to the number of residents has not changed significantly over the last years. Therefore, the given municipalities have a different concentration of tourism. It allows studying tourism impacts in areas of different tourism concentration.

The goal of the research is to study residents' perceptions of tourism impacts in municipalities with different tourism concentration and find possible differences between them. In this way the study offers a detailed insight into residents' perceptions of tourism impacts in the area of study. There are two questions that we try to answer in the study:

1. How do local residents in the municipalities of Piran and Koper perceive economic, socio-cultural and environmental tourism impacts?
2. Is there any difference in the perception of economic, socio-cultural and environmental tourism impacts between the residents of the municipalities of Piran and Koper?

In order to answer these questions, the research utilized a survey design. A questionnaire used among residents of the given municipalities is in the Appendix. The questionnaire of the current study was designed based on the review of literature concerning impacts of tourism to measure and collect residents' perceptions of tourism impacts. The initial questionnaire was pilot tested with a sample of 14 residents to ensure clarity and comprehensiveness. The revised questionnaire, which was corrected with minor changes, was then used in the survey.

The questionnaire was divided into four parts. The first part measured items regarding economic tourism impacts, the second part measured social tourism impacts, while the third part measured environmental tourism impacts. Demographic data regarding the residence municipality, gender and age were included in the last part of the questionnaire. Participants in the survey were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the items of the questionnaire. In fact, the first three parts of the questionnaire used 5-point Likert-type scales where 1 indicated "I strongly disagree", 2 indicated "I

¹ The number of residents is referred to June 30, 2007.

disagree", 3 indicated "I neither agree nor disagree", 4 indicated "I somewhat agree" and 5 indicated "I strongly agree".

The study was carried out between February and April 2008. Respondents were residents of the municipalities in question. Self-completed questionnaires were distributed personally to local residents in the municipalities of Koper and Piran using convenience sampling. It was used because we were not able to access a wider population due to cost and time constraints. Accordingly, a target of 110 respondents was set for the survey. Data gathered from the questionnaire were coded for statistical analysis. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data obtained from the survey. Descriptive statistics including mean values and standard deviations were employed and the t-test for independent samples was used to examine if there are any differences regarding the perceptions of tourism impacts between the residents of Piran and those of the Municipality of Koper. Factor analysis was not conducted because the ratio of sample size to number of variables was too small.

Results

A total of 111 questionnaires were collected. 54 respondents were from the Municipality of Piran and 57 respondents were from the Municipality of Koper (Table 1). The sample included 57 males and 54 females participating in the survey. The main age group was 40 – 49, followed by the age group 30 – 39. According to data of Statistical Office of Republic of Slovenia (SURS, 2008), age structure of the sample is somewhat different as population age structure in the municipalities. Although we cannot generalize the results on the entire population of the municipalities in question, the results represent important indicators of how residents perceive the impacts of tourism.

Table 1

PROFILE OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS (n = 111)

	All respondents (Frequency) n = 111	All respondents (%)	Piran (Frequency) n = 54	Piran (%)	Koper (Frequency) n = 57	Koper (%)
Age						
19 and under	3	2.7	0	0.0	3	5.3
20-29	28	25.2	7	13.0	21	36.8
30-39	30	27.0	18	33.3	12	21.2
40-49	30	27.0	22	40.8	8	14.0
50-59	14	12.7	6	11.1	8	14.0
60 and above	6	5.4	1	1.8	5	8.7
Gender						
Male	57	51	29	53.7	28	49.1
Female	54	49	27	46.3	27	50.9

Source: Own surveys

PERCEPTIONS OF ECONOMIC TOURISM IMPACTS

Descriptive statistics including mean values and standard deviations for each item of tourism impacts in the municipalities of Koper and Piran and the t-test for indepen-

dent samples are given in Table 2. Considering the mean values of economic tourism impacts, residents in both municipalities consider tourism as a generator of employment opportunities and as a cause of higher prices of real estate and consumer goods. Indeed, respondents gave the highest level of agreement with the statement that tourism causes an increase in the prices of real estate with the mean values 4.41 and 4.57 respectively. Moreover, a ranking of mean responses shows that the respondents in the municipalities of Koper and Piran gave the lowest grade of agreement to the statement that the majority of residents feel benefits of tourism in their own municipality with the mean values 2.47 and 2.67 respectively. According to the results of the item "income remains in the municipality" with the mean values 3.09 and 2.81 for the municipalities of Koper and Piran respectively, there are leakages of tourism income reflected outside the municipality, which can be caused by labor and capital flows. Standard deviations show wide differences among the residents of each municipality in all items.

Table 2

ECONOMIC, SOCIO-CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL TOURISM IMPACTS PERCEIVED BY LOCAL RESIDENTS IN THE MUNICIPALITIES OF KOPER AND PIRAN

Statement	All respondents		Municipality of Koper		Municipality of Piran		T-test	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Economic tourism impacts								
Generator of employment opportunities	3.78	1.11	3.86	0.97	3.70	1.25	0.735	0.464
Higher purchasing power	3.10	1.17	3.25	0.96	3.02	1.35	1.039	0.301
Higher prices of real estate*	4.49	0.92	4.41	0.85	4.57	0.99	-0.877	0.382
Higher prices of consumer goods	4.05	1.16	3.70	1.21	4.42	1.01	-3.346	0.001
Development of traffic system	2.80	1.16	3.19	1.16	2.43	1.04	3.669	0.000
Development of other public facilities	3.10	1.13	3.47	1.12	2.74	1.03	3.582	0.001
Tourism supports other industries	3.24	1.06	3.09	0.93	3.41	1.16	1.607	0.111
Income remains in the municipality	2.96	0.96	3.09	0.86	2.81	1.05	1.531	0.129
Majority of residents feels benefits*	2.57	1.11	2.47	1.14	2.67	1.10	-0.932	0.354
Socio-cultural tourism impacts								
Better medical care*	2.11	1.01	2.04	1.03	2.20	0.98	-0.882	0.379
Better police protection	2.45	0.97	2.49	0.95	2.41	1.00	0.453	0.651
Better quality of life	2.27	0.97	2.54	1.04	1.98	0.81	3.170	0.002
More cultural events	3.43	1.14	3.63	1.10	3.22	1.16	-1.912	0.059
A decline in traditional culture and habits	2.66	1.28	2.37	1.17	2.96	1.32	-2.510	0.013
Better conservation of cultural heritage	3.11	1.13	3.26	1.08	2.94	1.17	1.492	0.139
Pleasantness of living because of tourism	2.50	1.22	2.79	1.25	2.18	1.12	2.680	0.008
More opportunities to spend spare time	2.79	1.14	3.21	1.10	2.35	1.01	-4.278	0.000
Loss of traditional language	2.42	1.28	2.24	1.23	2.61	1.32	-1.509	0.134
Traffic congestion*	4.45	0.91	4.39	0.85	4.50	0.99	-0.611	0.543
More crime*	3.11	1.21	2.91	1.22	3.31	1.18	-1.763	0.081
Environmental tourism impacts								
Sea pollution*	3.35	1.32	3.18	1.31	3.54	1.31	-1.451	0.150
Excess of land construction	3.82	1.24	3.58	1.19	4.07	1.24	-2.141	0.034
Air pollution	2.99	1.23	2.87	1.21	3.11	1.25	-1.000	0.320
Soil pollution*	3.05	1.19	2.82	1.20	3.30	1.14	-2.145	0.034
Depletion of natural resources at the coastline	3.55	1.11	3.23	1.12	3.89	1.00	-3.271	0.001
Depletion of natural resources in the inland	3.07	1.02	2.89	1.04	3.26	0.96	-1.921	0.057
No preservation of fauna*	3.08	1.25	2.86	1.27	3.32	1.19	-1.963	0.052
No preservation of flora	3.19	1.17	3.00	1.20	3.39	1.16	-1.794	0.076
Noise pollution	3.73	1.13	3.49	1.18	4.00	1.01	-2.432	0.017
Litter of public areas	3.68	1.11	3.67	1.06	3.69	1.18	-0.087	0.931
Impaired view	3.17	1.25	2.96	1.19	3.39	1.28	-1.805	0.074

* According to the Levene's test equal variances are not assumed at the t-test

Source: Own surveys

According to the t-test results of economic tourism impacts, significant differences between respondents in the municipalities of Koper and Piran were found just in 3 of the 9 items at $p < 0.05$. There is a statistically significant difference of opinion between the respondents of the municipalities of Koper and Piran regarding items "development of traffic system", "development of other public facilities" and "higher prices of consumer goods". In fact, respondents from the Municipality of Koper perceive more positive tourism impacts regarding the development of the traffic system and other public facilities and less pressure of tourism on higher prices of consumer goods than the residents in the Municipality of Piran. There was no significant difference found between the respondents of the municipalities of Piran and Koper regarding their perception of other economic tourism impacts.

PERCEPTIONS OF SOCIO-CULTURAL TOURISM IMPACTS

The results reveal several socio-cultural problems related to tourism in the given municipalities. As evidenced by the mean responses, there is a general agreement among respondents in both municipalities that there are no positive socio-cultural tourism impacts perceived regarding medical care, police protection, quality of life, pleasantness of living in a municipality and traffic congestion. Indeed, respondents showed the highest level of agreement (mean = 4.39 in Koper and mean = 4.50 in Piran Municipality) with the item regarding traffic congestions caused by tourism. An agreement was found with the item "there are more culture events because of tourism" in both municipalities with the mean values 3.63 and 3.22 respectively. Furthermore, respondents in both municipalities do not perceive that tourism causes a decline in traditional culture and habits. In reference to the statement about the loss of traditional language, the scores suggest that respondents do not perceive that tourism diminishes the use of traditional language in the place where they live. The mean responses to this statement were 2.24 in the Municipality of Koper and 2.61 in the Municipality of Piran. All the items have high standard deviations representing wide differences among respondents.

The t-test statistical analysis further indicated 4 out of 11 statistically significant differences between the respondents in Koper and Piran referred to socio-cultural tourism impacts. Respondents in the Municipality of Koper have a statistically significantly higher level of agreement related to the statements about the "better quality of life", "pleasantness of living because of tourism" and "more opportunities to spend spare time" than the respondents in the Municipality of Piran. On the other hand, the residents in Piran have a statistically significantly higher level of agreement with the item "tourism contributes to a decline in traditional culture and habits" than the residents in the Municipality of Koper. The findings are not surprising since the tourist ratio is much higher in Piran than in the Municipality of Koper. The results reveal that there is no statistically significant difference in the perceptions of other socio-cultural tourism impacts between the residents of Koper and Piran.

PERCEPTIONS OF ENVIRONMENTAL TOURISM IMPACTS

Regarding environmental tourism impacts in Table 2, an excess of land construction caused by tourism is exposed in the municipalities of Koper and Piran with the highest mean responses, which are 3.58 and 4.07 respectively. High mean responses – 3.49 and higher – are also attributed to items, such as "noise pollution" and "litter of public areas" in the given municipalities. The residents of the Municipality of Piran perceive that tourism is an important factor of pollution in their own municipality, it litters public areas, destroys natural resources, impairs the view and does not help to preserve fauna and flora. The lowest mean response was attributed to air pollution (mean = 3.11) and soil pollution (mean = 3.30) in the Municipality of Piran and to soil pollution (mean = 2.82) and air pollution (mean = 2.87) in the Municipality of Koper. These two items are the less critical tourism environmental impacts in both municipalities according to the perceptions of residents. There is a divergence of opinion of all items among respondents reflected by high standard deviations. Nevertheless, we can derive that there is a general feeling among respondents in both municipalities that tourism has a negative impact on the environment.

An analysis of the t-test for independent samples of environmental tourism impacts found a statistically significant difference between the two groups of respondents in 4 out of 11 items. Respondents in the Municipality of Piran indicated that they are faced with more intensive problems of excess of land construction, depletion of natural resources at the coastline and in the inland and noise pollution than respondents in the Municipality of Koper. It is suggested that the residents of the Municipality of Piran perceive more negative tourism impacts than the residents of the Municipality of Koper. Other statistically significant differences were not found.

Discussion and conclusion

The goal of the paper was to estimate tourism impacts in the view of local residents in the municipalities of Koper and Piran and to examine whether there are differences concerning tourism impacts between the municipalities with different tourism concentration. The study highlights the problems as well as the benefits that the residents perceive from tourism. The paper represents new and additional findings to the existing research on tourism impacts.

Results reveal that in terms of positive tourism impacts, only employment opportunities can be exposed in the municipalities of Piran and Koper. In sum, the results reflect negative perceptions of residents regarding tourism impacts. Negative tourism impacts are exposed in both municipalities, particularly in the Municipality of Piran. The pressure of tourism concentration is found mostly in connection with environmental impacts, although negative socio-cultural and economic impacts are also present. In other words, a higher tourism concentration means higher pressure, especially on the environment, which can lead to environmental degradation. Furthermore, regarding economic and socio-cultural tourism impacts, the positive ones were found as well. Moreover, the pressure of negative impacts is aggravated by the strong seasonality, especially in the Municipality of Piran.

The results have shown that there are more negative tourism impacts (higher prices of consumer goods, a decline in traditional culture and habits, excess of land construction, depletion of natural resources at the coastline and in the inland, noise pollution) and less positive tourism impacts (better development of traffic system and other public facilities, better quality of life, pleasantness of living because of tourism, more opportunities to spend spare time) perceived in the Municipality of Piran where higher tourism concentration is presented.

The findings are relevant for policy makers and tourism managers. They both should become involved in reducing the socio-cultural and environmental pressure of tourism in the given municipalities. Knowledge of residents' perceptions of tourism impacts is essential to destination policy makers in developing tourism strategies and policies and for tourism managers in planning and managing tourism companies. Destination policy makers should attempt to develop environmentally-friendly tourism and try to establish better conditions to improve socio-cultural and some economic tourism impacts in order to develop sustainable tourism, preventing the conflict between local residents and the tourism industry. Negative socio-cultural impacts can be diminished also by introducing authenticity in tourism products (Sedmak, 2006). Unfortunately, some economic tourism impacts, such as prices and income leakages out of the municipality are hard or even impossible to improve. Local governments should, together with destination policy makers, try to pursue the policies that would improve tourism impacts. There should be a continuous track of the perceptions of residents about tourism impacts to measure the changes throughout time and eventually take appropriate measures to improve the conditions.

The results demonstrated that environmental tourism impacts need particular attention in both municipalities. Following the list of instruments by Sinclair and Stabler (1997), instruments such as levying taxes, charges applied to pollutants, licenses, quotas and permits and regulations through standards could be appropriate for environmental tourism impacts, while instruments such as grants and subsidies could be desirable for improving socio-cultural tourism impacts. Charges can be used to raise revenue to establish environment and cultural protection and environmental reparation.

The limitation of the study is in the small number of respondents. More respondents collaborating in the research would be desirable; however, this is connected with more costs for the survey. However, the research reveals important and valid information about perceptions of residents in environments with different tourism concentration.

Finally, the research highlights the need to expand our research to find if there is a homogeneity of residents' perceptions of tourism impacts in the given municipalities or whether there are groups or segments of residents with different perceptions of tourism impacts and, in this case, which are the factors that might influence residents' perceptions of tourism impacts.

Appendix

Questionnaire about tourism impacts

Please answer the questionnaire by circling the number that you agree with most for each statement below.

1 means "I strongly disagree", 2 means "I somewhat disagree", 3 means "I neither agree nor disagree",

4 means "I somewhat agree" and 5 means "I completely agree".

Code	Statement	Grade				
E1	Tourism is a generator of employment in the municipality I live in.	1	2	3	4	5
E2	There is a higher purchasing power in the municipality I live in because of tourism.	1	2	3	4	5
E3	Real estate prices are higher because of tourism in the municipality where I live.	1	2	3	4	5
E4	Consumer prices are higher because of tourism in the municipality where I live.	1	2	3	4	5
E5	We have a better traffic system because of tourism in the municipality where I live.	1	2	3	4	5
E6	There are better public areas (for example parks, promenades) because of tourism in the municipality where I live.	1	2	3	4	5
E7	Tourism is an important industry in our municipality on which many other industries in the municipality are dependant.	1	2	3	4	5
E8	Tourism income created in the municipality where I live remains in the municipality.	1	2	3	4	5
E9	The majority of residents have benefits from tourism in the municipality where I live.	1	2	3	4	5
S1	We have better medical care in our own municipality because of tourism.	1	2	3	4	5
S2	We have better police protection because of tourism presence in the municipality where I live.	1	2	3	4	5
S3	Tourism improves the quality of life in the municipality where I live.	1	2	3	4	5
S4	There are more cultural events in the municipality I live in because of tourism.	1	2	3	4	5
S5	Tourism contributes to a decline of traditional culture and habits in our municipality.	1	2	3	4	5
S6	Tourism contributes to better conservation of cultural heritage because of tourism in the municipality where I live.	1	2	3	4	5
S7	It is quite pleasant to live in our municipality because of the presence of tourism.	1	2	3	4	5
S8	We have more opportunities to spend spare time in the municipality I live in because of the presence of tourism.	1	2	3	4	5
S9	Tourism has an impact on the loss of our traditional language in our municipality.	1	2	3	4	5
S10	Tourism causes traffic congestions in our municipality.	1	2	3	4	5
S11	Tourism increases crime in our municipality.	1	2	3	4	5
O1	Tourism pollutes the sea in our municipality.	1	2	3	4	5
O2	There is an excess of land construction because of tourism in our municipality.	1	2	3	4	5
O3	Tourism pollutes the air in our municipality.	1	2	3	4	5
O4	Tourism pollutes the soil in our municipality.	1	2	3	4	5
O5	Tourism depletes the natural resources at the coastline in our municipality.	1	2	3	4	5
O6	Tourism depletes the natural resources in the inland in our municipality.	1	2	3	4	5
O7	Tourism has a negative impact on the preservation of fauna in our municipality.	1	2	3	4	5
O8	Tourism has a negative impact on the preservation of flora in our municipality.	1	2	3	4	5
O9	Tourism causes noise pollution in our municipality.	1	2	3	4	5
O10	Tourists litter public areas (for example the roads, pavements, beach) in our municipality.	1	2	3	4	5
O11	The view on the sea or landscape is impaired because of the presence of tourist objects in our municipality.	1	2	3	4	5

Please indicate your age group below:

- a) 19 or below
- b) 20 to 29
- c) 30 to 39
- d) 40 to 49
- e) 50 to 59
- f) 60 or over.

Are you

- a) male or
- b) female?

Thank you very much for completing the questionnaire!

References

- Aguillo, P. E., & Rossello N. J. (2005). Host community perceptions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 925-941.
- Andereck, K. (1995). Environmental Consequences of Tourism: A Review of Recent Research. In *Linking Tourism, the Environment, and Sustainability* (pp. 77-81). Annual Meeting of the National Recreation and Park Association.
- Andereck, K., & Vogh, C. A. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 27-36.
- Andereck, K., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, C., & Vogt, C. A. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1056-1076.
- Ap, J. (1990). Residents' Perception Research on the Social Impacts of Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11(4), 610-616.
- Besculides, A., Lee, M. E., & McCormick, P. J. (2002). Resident's perceptions of the cultural benefits of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(2), 303-319.
- Bestard, A. B., & Nadal, J. R. (2007). Modelling environmental attitudes toward tourism. *Tourism Management*, 28(3), 688-695.
- Bull, A. (1995). *The Economics of Travel and Tourism*. Melbourne: Longman.
- Curto, J. (2006). *Resident Perceptions of Tourism in a Rapidly Growing Mountain Tourism Destination*. Ontario (Canada). Retrieved from <http://uwspace.uwaterloo.ca/bitstream/10012/2904/1/jmcurto2006.pdf>
- Haralambopoulos, N., & Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived impacts of tourism: The case of Samoa. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(4), 503-526.
- Faulkner, B., & Tideswell, C. (1997). A Framework for Monitoring Community Impacts of tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 5(1), 3-28.
- Kuvan, Y., & Akan, P. (2005). Residents' attitudes toward general and forest-related impacts of tourism: the case of Belek, Antalya. *Tourism Management*, 26(5), 691-706.
- Lepp, A. (2007). Resident's attitudes towards tourism in Bigodi village, Uganda. *Tourism Management*, 28(3), 876-885.
- Liu, J. C., Sheldon, P.J., & Var, T. (1987). Resident perceptions of the environmental impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(1), 17-37.
- Liu, J. C., & Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13(1), 193-214.
- Page, S. J. (2003). *Tourism Management: Managing for Change*. Amsterdam etc.: Elsevier.
- Samuelson, P. A., & Nordhaus, W. D. (2005). *Economics*. Boston etc.: Mc-Graw-Hill Irwin.
- Sedmak, G. (2006). *Pomen avtentičnosti turističnega proizvoda – primer destinacije Piran*. Doctoral dissertation. Ljubljana: Ekonomska fakulteta.
- Smith, M., & Krannich, R. (1998). Tourism dependence and resident attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(4), 783-801.
- Sinclair, M. T., & Stabler, M. (1997). *The Economics of Tourism*. London: Routledge.
- SURS (2008). Statistični urad RS. Retrieved June 30, 2008, from www.stat.si
- Teye, V., Sirakaya, E., & Soenmez, S. (2002). Resident's attitudes to tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(4), 783-801.
- Tomljenovic, R., & Faulkner, B. (2000). Tourism and older residents in a sunbelt resort. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(1), 93-114.

- Tribe, J. (2005). *The Economics of Recreation, Leisure and Tourism*. Amsterdam etc.: Elsevier.
- Tsaur, S.-H., Lin, Y.-C., & Lin, J.-H. (2006). Evaluating ecotourism sustainability from the integrated perspective of resource, community and tourism. *Tourism Management*, 27(4), 640-653.
- Tosun, C. (2002). Challenges of sustainable tourism development in the developing world: The case of Turkey. *Tourism Management*, 22(2), 289-303.
- Urtasun, A., & Gutierrez, I. (2006). Tourism agglomeration and its impact o social welfare: An empirical approach to the Spanish case. *Tourism Management*, 27(5), 901-912.
- Vanhove, N. (2005). *The Economics of Tourism Destinations*. Amsterdam etc.: Elsevier.
- Williams, J., & Lawson, R. (2001). Community issues and resident opinions of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(2), 269-290.

Submitted: 8/18/2009

Accepted: 06/28/2010